UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,300	09/20/2005	Takashi Ishidoshiro	MEST093	1897

58766 7590 10/05/2009

Beyer Law Group LLP
P.O. BOX 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687

EXAMINER	
KHAN, MEHMOOD B	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/05/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTOmail@beyerlaw.com

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant argues on page 6 that Diener et al. and Wallstedt, taken alone, or in any proper combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed feature. More particularly, the Examiner has again asserted that Wallstedt teaches: a receiving synthesis unit that is connected to a receiving antenna by wired cable and performs diversity receiving with respect to received radio frequency signals (Final Office Action, page 4, citing Col. 6, lines 50-60 of Wallstedt). Again, it is noted that Wallstedt states that a "[b]lock 29 performs diversity combining of the signals received on the appropriate channel from the appropriate RAD" (Col. 6, lines 59-61). However, it is apparent that this teaching or general knowledge of diversity receiving does not properly address the claimed feature.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wallstedt discloses a system in which a antenna signals are received from multiple RADs **(Fig. 7: from RAD 3a-3d read as transceivers)** over an interface link **(Fig. 7: 4, Col 6: 5-10, where Wallstedt discloses a coaxial cable)** to a central hub **(Figs. 1 and 7: 2, i.e. a receiving synthesis unit)** which performs diversity combining **(Fig. 7: 29, Col 6: 50-60, where Wallstedt discloses diversity combining which is well known in the art as a signal processing technique performed on signals received from different antennas, so thus teaching diversity reception)**. Diener is relied up for the limitation of a terminal device located between a sending antenna and a receive antenna.

Applicant argues on page 7 the Examiner has not addressed the claimed configuration of a plurality of receiving antenna cases effectively provided around a sending antenna for diversity receiving in the Final Office Action. As such, it is very respectfully submitted that the Finality of the Office Action is improper for an additional reason and should be withdrawn. Applicant

reiterates the arguments submitted to the Examiner and again respectfully submits that Diener et al. and Wallstedt, taken alone, or in any proper combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed feature.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Wallstedt clearly discloses diversity reception **(please see response above)**. Diener clearly discloses receive antennas a around a sending antenna **(Fig. 11, which shows multiple RTs and a MRT read as receive antennas and a sending antenna, respectively; Please note that Diener inherently discloses the cited antennas to have a casing).** Diener clearly discloses a wired or wireless links back to a processor in a server **(Fig. 1)**.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion (i.e. improper combination as argued throughout the remarks) to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Wallstedt is directed to mobile communications in an indoor environment. Wallstedt does not exclude the use of reference terminals, as shown above, to locate target terminals in a wireless LAN. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine Wallstedt and Diener, whose disclosure is directed to location of terminals in a wireless LAN.

Thus the claimed limitations have been and met.